IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No. 22358 of 2005

For Approval and Signature:

HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.M.MEHTA

==========

1 Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? **-No.**

2 To be referred to the Reporter or not ? **-No.**

3 Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ? **-No.**

4 Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ? **-No.**

5 Whether it is to be circulated to the civil judge ? **-No.**

==========

HARSHID @ PINTOO RAMANBHAI SUTHAR - Petitioner(s)

Versus

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE AHMEDABAD CITY & 2 - Respondent(s)

==========

Appearance :
MR CHETAN B RAVAL for Petitioner(s) : 1,
RULE SERVED BY DS for Respondent(s) : 1 - 2.
GOVERNMENT PLEADER for Respondent(s) : 3,
==========

CORAM : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.M.MEHTA

Date : 13/12/2005

ORAL JUDGMENT

1. Harshid @ Pintoo Ramanbhai Suthar, petitioner has filed this habeas corpus petition under Article 226 of the

Constitution of India for quashing and setting aside the order of detention dated 7/9/2005 passed by the Police Commissioner, Ahmedabad. Here, it is a subject matter of Special Civil Application No.22328 of 2005. Petitioner is a co-detenu of the Special Civil Application No.22328 of 2005. Petition was filed on 12/11/2005. On 18/11/2005, this Court (Coram:K.M.Mehta,J.) has issued rule which is returnable on 8/12/2005. Hence, matter has been placed for final hearing to this Court.

2.Mr.H.B.Raval, learned advocate for Mr.C.B.Raval, learned advocate appears on behalf of petitioner. He has invited my attention to the order of detention dated 7/9/2005. He has also invited my attention to the order of committal dated 7/9/2005 by which the petitioner, detenu was sent to the Junagadh Jail. He has also invited my attention to the grounds supplied by the authority to the petitioner on 7/9/2005. All the grounds are same as of Special Civil Application No.22328 of 2005, which are as under:

1. Offence registered at Vatva Police Station in connection with Cr. Case No.487 of 2005 dated 5/8/2005 under the provisions of Section 379 and 114 of the IPC.

It is alleged that petitioner has committed offence in connection with one TVS Victor Motor Cycle valued at Rs.40,000/-.

2. Offence registered at JIDC Vatva Police Station in connection with Cr. Case No.107 of 2005 dated 20/8/2005 under the provisions of Section 457, 380 and 114 of the IPC. It is alleged that petitioner has committed offence in connection with one Kethesimek display valued at Rs.30,000/-, three Oriental Motor valued at Rs.50,000/-, Digital Makri Meter valued at Rs.2,000/-, one R.P.M. Meter valued at Rs.2,500/-, Computer System and Key-Board valued at Rs.10,000/-.

3. Offence registered at GIDC Vatva Police Station in connection with Cr. Case No.109 of 2005 dated 27/8/2005 under the provisions of Section 454, 457, 380 and 114 of the IPC. It is alleged that petitioner has committed offence in connection with computer set and its tools valued at Rs.48,000/-.

4. The authority has also stated that as petitioner is carrying on anti social activities and therefore, he is 'dangerous person' under the provisions of the PASA Act as the activities of the petitioner affects the public

order in this behalf.

5. On behalf of respondent, Mr.L.R.Pujari, learned APP appears. He has tried to support the order of detention on the basis of grounds stated in the order of detention. He has filed affidavit of Mr.K.R.Kaushik. In the affidavit, it is stated that grounds of detention are legal and valid and authority has specifically satisfied with the same before passing the order of detention.

6. Relying upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Piyush Kantilal Mehta, learned advocate for the petitioner has stated that authority ought not have passed the order of detention to detain petitioner only on the ground that he is a 'dangerous person'. Even if the authority could not be subjectively satisfied under the provisions of the PASA Act and detained the petitioner. There is no breach of public order. There is only breach of law and order.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner cannot be held as a 'dangerous person' within the meaning of PASA Act. There can be breach of law and order situation but not public order. For the

same, the learned advocate has relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Piyush Kantilal Mehta and also relied upon judgment of the Division bench of this Court (Coram:M.R.Calla and R.R.Tripathi, J.J.) in Letters Patent Appeal 223 of 2000 in Special Civil Application No.554 of 2000 in the case of Ashok Balabhai Makwana and judgment of the Division Bench of this Court (C.K.Thakkar, Acting C.J. and K.M.Mehta, J.) in the case of v. Police Commissioner, reported in 2000 (1) GLR 816, particularly para 21.

8. Having heard the learned counsel for both the parties, in my considered view, the detaining authority has passed the order of detention without there being any credible and cogent material in this behalf. Contentions of the petitioner are squarely covered by the decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Piyush Kantilal Mehta (supra) and Division Bench Judgment of this Court (Coram:M.R.Calla and R.R.Tripathi, J.J.) in the case of Ashokbhai Balabhai Makwana (supra) and another division bench judgment of this Court (C.K.Thakkar, Acting C.J. and K.M.Mehta, J.) in the case of Ashokbhai Jivrajbhai (supra). And therefore, the order of detention is required to be

quashed and set aside.

9. Having heard the rival submissions of the parties and perused the records of the case, I am of the view that only registration of criminal case alone cannot be said to be sufficient enough to arrive at the subjective satisfaction to the effect that the activities of the detenu are prejudicial to the public order. The power to detain a person under the PASA Act is not based on simple facts about registration of crimes. There has to be nexus and link for such activities which disturb the public order. The activities of the detenu must in the backdrop of the facts, reflect that such activities disturbed the even tempo or normal life of the community in the locality or disturbed general peace and tranquility or create a sense of alarm and insecurity in the locality. On careful perusal of the grounds of detention order and relying upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in Piyush Kantilal Mehta (supra), judgment and order dated 22/8/2000 of the Division Bench of this Court (Coram:M.R.Calla and R.R.Tripathi, J.J.) in L.P.A. No.223 of 2000 in S.C.A. No.554 of 2000, judgment of Division Bench of this Court (Coram:C.K.Thakkar, Acting C.J. and K.M.Mehta,J.) in the case of Ashokbhai Jivrajbhai and Special Civil

Application No.20420 of 2005 decided by this Court (Coram:K.M.Mehta, J.) on 15/11/2005, in my view, it cannot be said that the activities of the detenu are prejudicial to the public order. Therefore, the order of detention passed by the detaining authority cannot be sustained and is required to be quashed and set aside.

10.I have considered the facts and circumstances of the case in view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Piyush Kantilal Mehta (supra) and judgment in Letters Patent Appeal (supra) and other judgment cited by the petitioner. Considering all these, I am of the view that the activities of the petitioner may affect law and order situation and not affect the public order and therefore, subjective satisfaction arrived at by the authority is not legal and valid. Therefore, the order of detention passed by the authority is required to be quashed and set aside.

11.In view of the same, in Special Civil Application No.22328 of 2005 in the case of Srumit @ Pintoo Rameshbhai Bariya, which is allowed today, on the same ground, I hereby quash and set aside the order of

detention. Petition is allowed. Harshid @ Pintoo Ramanbhai Suthar, detenu is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith if he is not required in connection with any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly with no order as to cost. Direct service is permitted.

(K.M.MEHTA, J.)

(ila)